

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WEBB, wishes to speak as in morning business for a period of time of up to—how long? It does not matter. I would like to know.

Mr. WEBB. I would estimate 10 minutes, Mr. Leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the statement by the Senator from Virginia is completed—I ask the Senator from Virginia, would you rather complete your statement now? You are here ready to go; is that right?

Mr. WEBB. That is correct.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senator completes his statement—when ever that might be in the next 10 or so minutes, but that be today—the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 44, which was received from the House. I further ask consent that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees and that following the use or yielding back of time, the joint resolution be read a third time and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage, without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, just briefly reserving the right to object, I was unclear if the majority leader was trying to get the Senator from Virginia up right now. I have a very brief statement related to the joint resolution we are proceeding to.

Mr. REID. Madam President, what I would suggest is—and I am sure my friend from Virginia would have no objection—the Senator from Kentucky, the Republican leader, would make his statement, and it would be made as if during the half hour's time. Would that be OK?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. REID. So you would make that now. I know you have things going on in your office.

Is that OK with the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. WEBB. It is certainly OK with me. Thank you.

Mr. REID. So I modify my request to let the Senator from Kentucky speak for however long he desires for up to 30 minutes on the Burma resolution; following that, we go to Senator WEBB. I ask unanimous consent that my consent request be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry: Are we now on H.J. Res. 44?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. My understanding of the consent is that the Senator would speak against the half hour that was allotted on the resolution. Then we would go back to morning business briefly for a statement from Senator WEBB. And then we would return for the rest of the half hour of debate on the resolution the Senate will consider.

#### APPROVING THE RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN THE BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask the clerk to report the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, this legislation continues the sanctions already in place against Burma's illegitimate Peace and Development Council. If enacted, these sanctions will continue to show the SPDC that the United States stands squarely with the long-suffering people of Burma and against its brutal regime.

Just last month, the International Committee of the Red Cross condemned the actions of the Burmese regime—a rare vocal stance for an organization that has historically worked to bring about change behind the scenes. The ICRC's statement, according to international observers, is the harshest it has issued since the Rwandan genocide more than 12 years ago.

Burma's sham reforms are not fooling the Red Cross and they should not be fooling anyone else. The SPDC recently resumed its so-called constitutional convention, a convention in which most delegates were selected by the regime itself and in which delegates are not allowed to offer draft changes without permission. Criticism of the draft constitution is prohibited by law. One notable provision in the draft forbids the spouse of a foreign national from sitting in Parliament, an addition clearly aimed at National League for Democracy leader and Nobel Peace Prize winner Aung San Suu Kyi, whose British husband died in 1999.

The SPDC calls the convention a "roadmap" to democracy. But on the SPDC's map, the destination is not freedom, it is tyranny.

Until the NLD and Burma's ethnic minorities are fully included in the governing process, until this process reflects true democratic principles, this convention should be shunned—shunned—by the international commu-

nity. A sham constitutional process is a step backwards, not forward.

With that said, there are some encouraging signs. International pressure on the Burmese regime has begun to increase. Members of the Association of Southeast Asia Nations have expressed concern about the SPDC's behavior, and much like the ICRC's condemnation, recent statements of ASEAN members represent a departure from traditional practice. Clearly, there is growing international impatience with the Burmese regime.

I am proud to say that the United States has long been at the vanguard of the movement to democratize Burma. Others, such as ASEAN, are following our lead. They are beginning to recognize the moral imperative to help the people of this beleaguered nation.

I am also proud of the continued unified stance taken by the Senate over the years with respect to Burma. On Monday, the Senate Finance Committee voted out this bill unanimously. The legislation has 60 cosponsors and once again enjoys broad bipartisan support.

I am pleased to be joined again by my good friend and cosponsor, the senior Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I also thank Rich Harper of her staff for all the hard work he has put forward to make this legislation possible. On the Republican side, my good friend Senator MCCAIN continues to use his respected voice to support the Burmese people.

It is time for the Senate, once again, to go on record and show that we stand with the people of Burma. As we do, we can be confident of their gratitude.

In a recent book on the plight of the Burmese people by author Emma Larkin, a Burmese man urges outside nations to keep the pressure on. "Change has to come from outside," he says. "The world must pinch Burma harder. . . . Give any money to these generals and it is like watching a poisonous plant grow."

Let's show that we stand for freedom and against oppression, for real democratic progress and against hollow promises of reform, against the poisonous plant that is the SPDC.

I urge my Senate colleagues to support adoption of this joint resolution.

Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays for when we ultimately get back to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WEBB. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WEBB. Madam President, I wish to address two issues this afternoon. Before I do, I say to the Republican leader that I will gladly support his

joint resolution. I spent time in Burma. I have observed the situation on the ground. We do need to engage Burma and assist in its movement toward better political conditions, but I believe sanctions are clearly appropriate.

(The further remarks of Mr. WEBB are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. WEBB. Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WEBB. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WEBB. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that any time remaining in the quorum call be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WEBB. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DARFUR

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I return to the floor to discuss the ongoing genocide in Darfur. Most of the discussion on the floor of the Senate and in Congress for the last several weeks has been about Iraq, and appropriately so, yet the time spent dealing with the failed policy in Iraq is a stark reminder of how it also distracts us from so many other critical issues around the world. One issue in particular is the 4-year humanitarian tragedy in the Darfur region of Sudan.

Sadly, in front of the global community's eyes, we have witnessed unspeakable horror—mass killings, rape, torture, the torching of homes and entire villages. The estimates of death are wide ranging, from 200,000 to 400,000. Some 2½ million people have been displaced from their homes, and there is a mounting refugee crisis in neighboring Chad and the Central African Republic.

Despite a worldwide call for action, the tragedy continues. The genocide in Sudan is becoming increasingly complicated and tragic. The violence threatens to destabilize an entire region, and without change there is little end in sight. Today, we have an important opportunity to break the cycle of violence, an opportunity that we must seize.

After years of duplicity and stalling, Sudanese President Bashir agreed last month to a significantly expanded joint United Nations-African Union peacekeeping force. We have to seize that opportunity and seize it quickly. Unfortunately, there are already disturbing signs this window may be closing. Yesterday, the Washington Post covered a visit by President Bashir to the Darfur section of his country. President Bashir said that people there were "living normal lives;" that only 9,000 people had died and that "most of Darfur is now secure and enjoying real peace." He rejected foreign intervention in the conflict.

This crisis has gone on long enough. Over 2 years ago, President Bush declared a genocide in Darfur. Secretary of State Colin Powell joined in that chorus. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice also agreed. And the President said: Not on my watch—remembering the horror of Rwanda, where 800,000 people died in a genocide during the Clinton administration. President Clinton did not respond at that time, has regretted it ever since, and said so publicly. President Bush said the same thing would not happen in his administration. I have reminded the President now several times on the floor of the Senate and personally that his administration is coming to an end. If he is going to do anything about the crisis and genocide in Darfur, he needs to move and move quickly.

The need is simple: rapid deployment of a full peacekeeping force. We have seen this type of urgency with other peacekeeping forces, including last year in Lebanon, and we must act with similar speed for the people, the victims, suffering in Darfur.

Last week, U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon and I had a good conversation. He returned my call on the telephone and we spoke for a few minutes. We talked about the importance of rapidly deploying a new peacekeeping force and of working toward a long-term political settlement in this region. It is my hope that our United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Zalmay Khalilzad, will work closely with Secretary General Ban Ki-moon to make these steps a reality.

The U.N. Security Council will be meeting soon to authorize this force. The Security Council should be firm in its mandate and its timeline.

The needs are clear. The force must have sufficient resources and numbers. We can help. The United States has resources set aside for peacekeeping efforts in the world. I can't think of many more pressing than the genocide in Darfur. If we are not providing soldiers, we certainly need to be providing resources.

It must have a strong chapter VII mandate for protecting civilians, peacekeepers, and humanitarian workers. Some of these nongovernmental organizations, these humanitarian workers, have been the victims of the violence in Darfur. Men and women

who are risking their lives to provide the basic necessities of life have been the targets themselves, for the jingawet militia and all the violence taking place there. This U.N. force must have a clear command-and-control structure and firm timetable. It should be clear day-to-day operational instructions come from the United Nations. The U.N. mandate must set benchmarks and hold the Sudanese Government accountable for any failure to cooperate. In particular, there should be no room for further stalling or reinterpretation by the Sudanese Government. We have been blindsided too many times by President Bashir of Sudan, who has said so many times there is no problem in Darfur; you can bring in a force; no, I have changed my mind.

As this man has weaved back and forth, more and more innocent people have died and been displaced from their homes. We must match this peacekeeping force with a renewed diplomatic effort to bring about a long-term political settlement, including naming a Special Representative of the Secretary General to monitor implementation of a comprehensive peace agreement.

The force must be deployed immediately. The notion that we are going to do this months from now is unacceptable.

Finally, we need a long-term political settlement to match the peacekeeping effort. I call on the United States, the United Nations, and the African Union to continue intensive negotiations with all parties.

I also strongly urge all parties, including those representing nonsignatory Darfur rebel movements, to participate fully in the U.N.-African Union-led negotiations and to tirelessly cooperate in the effort to bring about a political solution that will return peace and stability to the people of Darfur.

Those who choose not to participate leave themselves open to further international isolation and sanction. Each day we delay on peacekeeping and political settlement efforts leads to more death, more rape, more human suffering, more people displaced from their homes, more desperate refugees. Each day we delay, the crisis becomes more complex, with increased violence and numbers of refugees spilling over into neighboring countries creating burdens and instabilities there. Each day we delay gives President Bashir another opportunity to stall and back away from his commitment. Each day we delay is a further indictment of the global community's failure to act decisively in the face of genocide.

We must not wait another day. Let us not forget the major export of Sudan is oil. The major company in Sudan that is drilling the oil and exporting it is PetroChina, a company controlled by the Chinese Government. The Chinese need to be involved in this as well, first at the United Nations and then beyond.

A few weeks ago, after an article appeared in the Wall Street Journal written by Mia Farrow, the actress, the Chinese finally responded and made some overtures toward the Bashir Government, saying they had to act. We have not heard anything since.

It is time for the Chinese to step up. If they want to be part of this global community, they should stand on the side of civilized conduct. They should condemn the genocide in Darfur and do more.

In closing, I thank President Bush, Secretary General Ban, and U.N. Ambassador Khalilzad. I want them to know there is strong support in the Congress for swift action to field this peacekeeping force. Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have spoken out for years on the need to do more to halt the genocide in Darfur. We will and we must continue to focus this concern on doing everything we can to halt this genocide.

I hope we have an active voice and role in this debate in the Senate. Yes, we can do many things—our legislative business—but not ignoring the rest of the world. I hope, in the next 2 weeks, we can take action on the floor to adopt resolutions and to make it clear, on a bipartisan basis, we want the U.N. peacekeeping force to act and act quickly in response.

We should also be working with the Ambassadors from countries that are represented in the African Union, as well as those on the Security Council, to reassure them that the United States wants swift action. We need to make sure our appropriations bills reflect the need for resources to make this a success. As the President said more than 2 years ago, "Not on my watch." We in the Congress, we in the Senate, should say the same, and we should follow that statement with action.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Illinois on his remarks. Not only were they heartfelt but they were certainly cogent and certainly correct.

My warmest congratulations to the Senator.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I come to speak to the passage of the joint resolution renewing the import sanctions on Burma for another year. This legislation has been introduced for several years now by Senator MCCONNELL and myself. I began working on this issue with Senator Bill Cohen a long time ago when he was in this body.

Yesterday, the House passed the joint resolution by voice vote and the Senate Finance Committee reported the McConnell-Feinstein bill to the Senate floor on a unanimous bipartisan basis, so I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

These sanctions are set to expire in 2 days, that is July 26, and any delay will

only serve to benefit the ruling military junta in Burma—the State Peace and Development Council is its name—at the expense of Nobel Peace Prize Laureate and leader of the National League for Democracy Aung San Suu Kyi and the democratic opposition in Burma.

I remind my colleagues that the National League for Democracy, headed by Aung San Suu Kyi, decisively won the last parliamentary elections in 1989. These sanctions will be renewed for 1 year, so we will have a chance to discuss them in a year if the military junta should decide to make some reforms. But, simply put, the junta to date has failed to take any meaningful steps to release Suu Kyi and other political prisoners. There are over a thousand political prisoners many of her political party, elected to the Parliament, who remain in prison.

Last month, we celebrated the 62nd birthday of Aung San Suu Kyi. She spent her day, as she has for most of her past 17 years, alone and under house arrest—17 long years alone in a house in Burma, with no communication with the outside world. In May, the State Peace and Development Council renewed her sentence for yet another year.

I am heartened to know the Senate and the international community are coming together to ensure the abuses and injustices of the military junta in Burma do not go unnoticed.

Earlier this year, 45 Senators signed a letter to U.N. Secretary Ban Ki-moon, urging him to get personally involved in pressing for Suu Kyi's release. In a recent letter addressed to the State Peace and Development Council, a distinguished group of 59 former heads of State, including former Filipino President Corazon Aquino, former Czech President Vaclav Havel, former British Prime Minister John Major, and former Presidents Bill Clinton, Jimmy Carter, and George H.W. Bush, called for the regime to release Aung San Suu Kyi. They correctly noted that:

Aung San Suu Kyi is not calling for revolution in Burma but rather peaceful, non-violent dialog between the military, National League for Democracy, and Burma's ethnic groups.

What kind of threat can that be to a government? The calls for Suu Kyi's release are also coming from Burma's neighbors. The Association of South-west Asian Nations, known as ASEAN, now recognizes that Burma's actions are not an internal matter but a significant threat to peace and stability in the region. At a meeting of senior diplomats last month, ASEAN made a clear call for Aung San Suu Kyi's release. That call is so welcome. I would like to encourage ASEAN to continue to speak out.

Last month, the women of the Senate—and you were one, Madam President—came together to form the Women's Caucus on Burma, to express our solidarity with Suu Kyi, to call for her

immediate release and urge the United Nations to pass a binding resolution on Burma.

We did not do this in vain. The United Nations did pass a resolution earlier this year, but unfortunately it was vetoed by China and Russia. At our inaugural event, we were pleased to be joined by First Lady Laura Bush, who added her own voice to those calling for peace and democracy in Burma.

Our message is spreading and it is clear and we will not remain silent. We will not stand still until Aung San Suu Kyi and all political prisoners are released and democratic government is restored in Burma. Let us not forget that this human rights situation compels us to action. Consider this: There are still 1,300 political prisoners in jail. According to the U.N. Special Rapporteur, over 3,000 villages have been destroyed by the military junta; 70,000 child soldiers have been forcibly recruited; and over half a million people are internally displaced in Burma today; and over 1 million people have fled Burma in the past two decades, destabilizing Burma's neighbors.

The practice of rape as a form of repression has been sanctioned by the Burmese military. Use of forced labor is widespread. Human trafficking is rampant. Burma is the world's second largest opium producer, after Afghanistan, and increasingly a source of trafficking of synthetic narcotics.

Sanctions are not a panacea for every problem, and in many cases they don't work, but in this instance, we still hope they can be effective. Suu Kyi herself has said this:

We would like the world to know that economic sanctions do not hurt the common people of Burma. We would like the European Community, the United States and the rest of the world to be aware that sanctions do help the movement for democracy in Burma.

Members of this body, this is an amazing woman, a Nobel Peace Prize winner, under house arrest for the better part of 17 years because her party was democratically elected to lead Burma. We should speak out. This resolution is one way of doing that.

I urge its passage.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 44, the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act. This legislation will send a strong message to the military leaders of Burma, by renewing sanctions on their repressive regime.

As cochairman of the Senate Women's Caucus on Burma, I have closely monitored the political situation in that country, including the inspiring leadership of a brave Burmese woman named Aung San Suu Kyi. A former winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, Aung San Suu Kyi has dedicated her life for the cause of democracy in her country, including spending most of the last 17 years in detention.

I have been proud to stand with the other women of the Senate on behalf of

Aung San Suu Kyi. In May 2007, I joined with Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator COLLINS, Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator STABENOW, and First Lady Laura Bush at a press event to show our concern for Aung San Suu Kyi, and the need for the U.S. Government to stand in solidarity with the people of Burma.

By passing the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, we are reengaging on this vitally important issue, but we can do, and must do, more. The U.S. should use its influence with the international community to put more pressure on the Burmese to stop the murder, oppression and imprisonment of its critics.

I know that Aung San Suu Kyi—and the people of Burma—will applaud this landmark legislation. I am proud to cosponsor it, and I urge my Senate colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I want to offer a few comments on H.J. Res. 44, which will renew the import ban we first imposed on Burma in 2003.

The Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act was our response to the reprehensible attack on the National League for Democracy which occurred on May 30, 2003, and the arrest of many NLD officials, including their leader, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi.

I worked with my colleagues, Senator McCONNELL and Senator BAUCUS, to develop and pass that legislation. We authorized a ban on imports from Burma, subject to annual renewal by Congress.

As Senator BAUCUS and I noted after the Senate passed that legislation, the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act contains a guarantee of ongoing congressional oversight. We felt it was important that the Congress revisit the issue of trade sanctions on Burma each year. That way, Congress can consider whether, in light of any changed circumstances, it is appropriate to renew the ban on Burmese imports for another year.

Unfortunately, the situation in Burma has not improved. The human rights record in Burma remains extremely poor. There is a pattern of government policies that suppress liberties. The abuses have been extensive and the trend continues to worsen. There are reportedly over 1,000 political-prisoners in jail. Daw Aung San Suu Kyi has spent 11 out the past 18 years under house arrest.

In December 2006, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution expressing its grave concern over human rights violations in Burma. In addition, Burma poses serious risks to peace and security in the region. This is not the time to reward the bad actions of the illegitimate Burmese Government.

We should send a strong signal to the military junta that their ongoing behavior is unacceptable. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of continuing the trade sanctions against Burma for another year.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, "Do what you can, with what you have,

where you are." These essential principles for action, articulated by President Theodore Roosevelt, aptly apply to America's sanctions policy against the Burmese Government.

Four years ago, Congress enacted the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 in response to the Burmese junta's brutal crackdown on democracy advocate Aung San Suu Kyi and her followers. At the time, there were few options available to the Congress to change events in Burma. Congress did what it could with the tools available at that time.

Tragically, 4 years later, conditions in Burma have worsened. Suu Kyi remains under house arrest, which she has endured for most of the last two decades. The junta continues to commit gross human rights violations including extrajudicial killings, rape, and torture. Security forces continue to compel citizens into forced labor, and beat and abuse prisoners. And the junta's poor economic policies have made Burma one of the most impoverished countries in Asia.

When Congress considered the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act in 2003, I expressed reservations about whether these new sanctions would have the desired effect. Too often, unilateral sanctions only worsen the plight of the oppressed people we seek to support. Too often, they fail to weaken the tyrannical governments at which they are targeted. That is why Senator GRASSLEY and I worked together to ensure that the import sanctions would not be open-ended. We agreed to revisit the ban on an annual basis to ensure that they remain the proper policy to address America's human rights concerns with Burma.

Over the last year, we have seen limited progress in our efforts to enlist the cooperation of Burma's trading partners to isolate the regime. The European Union has renewed its sanctions against Burma. Some ASEAN-member countries, which previously declined to publicly criticize the Burmese Government, are now calling for change. But none of these measures yet amounts to a unified and forceful deterrent to Burma's ruling military junta.

Democracy, national reconciliation, and respect for human rights in Burma can only be achieved if we enlist more than just the moral support of other countries. We must enlist Burma's trading partners, particularly its neighbors, to take more concrete actions that put real economic and political pressure on the military generals. I urge the administration to intensify its efforts to garner international cooperation to isolate the junta. I will support renewal of the import ban on Burma, because I am hopeful that we will see greater progress in the year ahead. In renewing the import ban on Burma, I believe we will follow the right course of action: to do what we can, with the best tools available, where we are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res 44) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 276 Leg.]

#### YEAS—93

Akaka	Domenici	McConnell
Alexander	Dorgan	Menendez
Allard	Durbin	Mikulski
Barrasso	Ensign	Murkowski
Baucus	Feingold	Murray
Bayh	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bennett	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Grassley	Pryor
Bingaman	Gregg	Reed
Bond	Hagel	Reid
Boxer	Harkin	Roberts
Brown	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bunning	Hutchison	Salazar
Byrd	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Inouye	Schumer
Cardin	Isakson	Sessions
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	Kerry	Smith
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Snowe
Coburn	Kohl	Specter
Cochran	Kyl	Stabenow
Coleman	Landrieu	Stevens
Collins	Lautenberg	Sununu
Conrad	Leahy	Tester
Corker	Levin	Thune
Cornyn	Lieberman	Vitter
Craig	Lincoln	Voinovich
Crapo	Lott	Warner
DeMint	Lugar	Webb
Dodd	Martinez	Whitehouse
Dole	McCaskill	Wyden

#### NAYS—1

Enzi

#### NOT VOTING—6

Brownback	Clinton	McCain
Burr	Johnson	Obama

The resolution (H.J. Res. 44) was passed.

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.